Appl. No. 10/789,562

Amdt. dated May 24, 2007

Reply to Office Communication of May 8, 2007

# Amendments to the Drawings:

Attached is a replacement sheet for Figure 1. This sheet replaces the sheet filed September 20, 2004. No annotated sheet is included, as the replacement sheet is submitted to provide a lighter copy of the Figure.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Appl. No. 10/789,562 Amdt. dated May 24, 2007

Reply to Office Communication of May 8, 2007

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

## Status of the claims

Claim 17 is currently pending in the application. Claims 1 and 18-22 have been withdrawn by the Examiner.

The status identifier for claim 1 has been updated to reflect that the claim is withdrawn.

Claim 17 has been amended to recite that the factor VIII/vWF-containing solution is a cryoprecipitate, or a supernatant or extract of a recombinant cell culture. Support can be found, e.g., at page 9, lines 18-21. Thus, no new matter is added by this amendment.

The Examiner requested clarification of amendments to the claims in view of the status identifiers for claim 17 and 21 set forth in the amendment filed March 3, 2006. The status identifier of claim 17 in the amendment inadvertently listed it as "new." As noted by the Examiner, it should have been designated "previously presented". The designation of claim 21 as "currently amended" was also an error. Claim 21 was not amended and should have designated as "previously presented". Applicants thank the Examiner for proceeding with the examination.

## Priority

The Examiner has required an official, ribboned copy of the foreign priority application Austria A 338/97 filed on February 27, 1997 in order to obtain the priority benefit of that application. Applicants note that a certified copy of Austria A 338/97 was filed with the USPTO on May 14, 2004 during prosecution of U.S. Application No. 10/003,621 (the '621 application), now U.S. Patent No. 6,953,837. The '621 application is a divisional of the same parent application, U.S. Application No. 09/367,459, as the present application. Applicants respectfully request that the current requirement to provide a certified copy to the USPTO be deemed to have been met in view of the certified copy submitted for the '621 application.

## Objections to the specification

Appl. No. 10/789,562 Amdt. dated May 24, 2007

Reply to Office Communication of May 8, 2007

The specification was objected to for various informalities. The Examiner has required: i) updated priority information to include the issued patent number of the parent application, ii) a more descriptive title, and iii) capitalization of trademarks and inclusion of generic terminology. Applicants have amended the specification to address these objections. The amendments add no new matter.

#### Drawings

The drawings were objected to because Figure 1 is allegedly dark, thereby making it difficult to discern the lanes. Although the version of Figure 1 as filed September 20, 2004 that is in our files has clearly discernable lanes, .Applicants provide herewith the required replacement copy.

## Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 17 was rejected as directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner alleges that the claim reads on a product of nature. In order to expedite prosecution, claim 17 has been amended. The present claim clearly reflects "the hand of the inventor". Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore requested.

## Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 17 was rejected as allegedly indefinite for the recitation of "substantially free". In order to expedite prosecution, claim 17 has been amended to delete the recitation.

Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

#### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 17 was rejected as allegedly anticipated by SCLAVO in EP 600 4800. Applicants respectfully traverse.

It is well settled that anticipation can be found only when a cited reference discloses all of the elements, features or limitations of a claimed invention. (see, e.g., Scripps Appl. No. 10/789,562 Amdt. dated May 24, 2007

Reply to Office Communication of May 8, 2007

Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc., 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991) and MPEP § 2131).

SCLAVO, however, describes the purification of Factor VIII/vWF complex from total human plasma. As amended claim 17 recites that the factor VIII/vWF-containing solution is a cryoprecipitate, or a supernatant or extract of a recombinant cell culture. SCLAVO does not teach this element. According, the reference is not anticipatory. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol A. Fang Reg. No. 48,631

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3834

Tel: 925-472-5000 Fax: 415-576-0300 Attachments CAF:cig

61060244 v1